

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/607,374	06/30/2000	Anthony Chavez	14917.0245USU1/MS140744.0 8223		
27488 MERCHANT	7590 10/03/200' & GOULD (MICROSO	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 2903			BASOM, F	BASOM, BLAINE T	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2173		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No.	Applicant(s)			
09/607,374	CHAVEZ ET AL.	CHAVEZ ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit	44.0.0		
Blaine Basom	2173			

Advisory Action	09/607,374	CHAVEZ ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Blaine Basom	2173				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress			
		•				
	IE REPLY FILED <u>20 September 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of					
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff	idavit, or other evider	nce, which			
places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No	tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	compliance with 37 C	FR 41.31; or (3)			
a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance	ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mi	ust be filed within one	of the following			
time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection					
		in the final rejection, wh	ichever is later. In			
	b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	• •	136(a) and the appropria	to oxtonoion foo			
nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex						
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the	shortened statutory period for reply orig	inally set in the final Offi	ce action; or (2) as			
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)		te of the final rejection,	even if timely filed,			
NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte						
a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	within the time period set forth in 3	37 CFR 41.37(a).				
AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	•		ecause			
 (a)		i ⊏ below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	•	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
appeal; and/or	,,	and in grant purifying				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	* **					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		A'				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	nowable if submitted in a separate,	umely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. Sor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	⋈ will not be entered, or b) □ will not be entered, or b) □ will not be entered.	II be entered and an	explanation of			
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro			·			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			•			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but						
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the anida	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing	a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the	date of filing a brief,	will not be			
entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar						
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/QTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	intry is below or attacl	ned.			
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
See Continuation Sheet.		1/				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	///				
13.						
		IOUN OFF	•			
	CIIDEN	JOHN CABECA				
	SUPERV	ISORY PATENT EXAM	MINE:			

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No. 09/607,374

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendments incorporate new limitations that require further consideration and search. For example, the proposed amendment to claim 1 entails help contents usable by a unified taxonomy structure of help categories and help topics. Whereas previous versions of claim 1 express mapping help topics of the help contents into a unified taxonomy structure, no previous version of any claim expresses help contents usable by a unified taxonomy structure. Moreover, a recitation expressing that the help contents are usable by a unified taxonomy structure changes the scope of claim 1. Accordingly, further consideration and search is required.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicants' argue that the claims, as amended by the proposed amendments, are allowable over the art of record. However, since the the proposed amendments have not been entered, the Applicants' arguments are respectfully considered moot.